

SEP 17 2007

PATENT
IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Application No. : 10/687,094
Confirmation No. : 9102
Applicant : Daniel Klees
Filed : Oct. 17, 2003
Title : Calibration rig
TC/A.U. : 2856
Examiner : R. R. Raevis
Docket No. : KLEE3001CIP/FJD
Customer No. : 23364

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER IS BEING FACSIMILE
TRANSMITTED TO THE U.S. P.T.O. ON THE DATE SHOWN
BELOW:

Date: 9/17/2007

By: Felix J. D'Ambrosio

Felix J. D'Ambrosio

TELEPHONE DISCUSSION

Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA. 22202-3514

Sir:

Pursuant to the provisions of 37 CFR 1.2, the undersigned wishes to make of record the telephone discussion of today during which clarification was requested of the examiner regarding the Office Action of August 1, 2007.

1) The Office Action states on page 2 that "claims 10, 11 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph . . .," then at the bottom of page 2, the examiner states "As to claim 12, there is no support . . .".

The examiner was asked if the rejection extended to claim 12 and not just claims 10 and 11. The examiner replied that the rejection should read "claims 10-13 are rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph.....".

2) The Office Action states that claims 9, 14 and 15 are rejected over art. There is no art rejection of claims 10-13. The examiner was asked if claims 10-13 contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if the rejections under 35 USC 112 were overcome. The examiner responded in the affirmative, that is, claims 10-13 contain allowable subject matter over the art of record.

U.S. Pat. Appl. 10/687,094

A response will be filed to the Office Action of August 1, 2007 as modified by the clarification noted in 1) and 2) above..

Respectfully submitted

Date: September 17, 2007



Felix J. D'Ambrosio
Reg. No. 25,721

BACON & THOMAS, PLLC
625 Slaters Lane - 4th Floor
Alexandria, VA 22314
(703) 683-0500

S:\Prodcert\jfd\CLIENTS\Endress+Hauser Holding GmbH\KLEE3001CIP-FL0168\Revised Response June 14, 2007.wpd